

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

Paul Wayne Nagy, et al.

Serial No.: 10/711,100

Filed: August 23, 2004

For: RADIO BIN SPACER

Attorney Docket No.: IAC 04920 PUS

Group Art Unit: 3632

Examiner: Amy Jo Sterling

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief from the final rejection of claims 1-17 of the Office Action mailed on December 13, 2007 for the above-identified patent application.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is International Automotive Components Group North America, Inc. ("Assignee"), a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware, and having a place of business at 5300 Auto Club Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48126, as set forth in the assignment recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 27, 2007 at Reel 019215/Frame 0727.

## **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known to the Appellant, the Appellant's legal representative, or the Assignee which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

## **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1-17 have been rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

## **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

All amendments previously filed have been entered. No amendment after final rejection has been filed.

## **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The invention relates to a radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designated for a larger radio. A generally rectangular radio bin spacer (10) having one closed rear end (2) and one open end (1) and further having a planar top wall (3), a planar bottom wall (3) and two planar side walls (3). The top wall has a structural rib (5) located thereon. The side walls each have a mounting tab (6) located thereon wherein each of the mounting tabs (6) has a bore (7) located therein. The closed rear end (2) of said bin (10) has a pair of spacer stanchions (4) located thereon. Said bin (10) has exterior dimensions that allow it to be mounted within an instrument panel opening that is designed for a larger than standard sized radio and further has interior dimensions that allow for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein. This assembly provides a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel that is sized for a larger radio. (See claim 1; figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0014-0018.)

Another expression of the invention also relates to a radio bin spacer that allows for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designed for a larger radio. The invention relates to a radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designated for a larger radio. A generally rectangular radio bin spacer (10) having one closed rear end (2) and one open end (1) and further having a planar top wall (3), a planar bottom wall (3) and two planar side walls (3). The top wall has a structural rib (5) located thereon. The side walls each have a mounting tab (6) located thereon wherein each of the mounting tabs (6) has a bore (7) located therein. Structural ribs (8) are located on the side walls (3) adjacent to the mounting tabs (6). The closed rear end (2) of said bin (10) has a pair of spacer stanchions (4) located thereon. Said bin (10) has exterior dimensions that allow it to be mounted within an instrument panel opening that is designed for a larger than standard sized radio and further has interior dimensions that allow for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein. This assembly provides a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel that is sized for a larger radio. (See claim 1; figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0014-0018.)

## **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0032426 to Tanaka.

Claims 2-7 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0032426 to Tanaka and in view of United States Patent No. 6,330,121 to Kobayashi et al.

Claims 8, 9, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0032426 to Tanaka and in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0231954 to Czech.

## VII. ARGUMENT

### A. **Claims 1 And 10 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Over United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0032426**

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0032426 to Tanaka (hereinafter "Tanaka"). Applicants believe that the Examiner rejected these claims in error and ask that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention. *RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc.*, 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In other words, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Accordingly, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In addition, "the elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *In Re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

If the prior art reference does not expressly set forth a particular element of the claim, that reference still may anticipate if that element is "inherent" in its disclosure. To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or

possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. *In Re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Claim 1 reads as follows, with the portions relevant to this appeal shown in bold:

1. A radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designed for a larger radio comprising:

a generally rectangular radio **bin** spacer having one closed rear end and one open end and further having a planar top wall, a planar bottom wall and two planar side walls;  
said top wall having a structural rib located thereon;  
said side walls each having a mounting tab located thereon wherein each said mounting tab has a bore located therein;  
said closed rear end of said bin **having a pair of spacer stanchions located thereon**; and  
said **bin** having exterior dimensions allowing mounting within an instrument panel opening designed for a larger than standard sized radio and further **having interior dimensions allowing mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein**;  
**thereby providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio.**

The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation to support the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims for several reasons. First, Tanaka fails to disclose a bin. A bin is defined as a box, frame, crib, or enclosed place used for storage. Tanaka fails to disclose this. Rather, Tanaka discloses a "connector having a simple structure assuring a stable mounting operation." See Tanaka, title. The invention disclosed in Tanaka "relates to a connector having an electromagnetic shielding function and adapted to be mounted on a board such as a printed circuit board known in the art." See Tanaka, ¶ 0002. Tanaka's summary of the invention further describes the invention of Tanaka:

[0007] It is therefore an object of the present invention to provide a connector having simple structure assuring a stable operation of mounting the connector to a circuit board and a stable operation of attaching the connector to a chassis panel.

[0008] It is another object of the present invention to provide a connector which is enhanced in connecting strength between a front shell [sic] and a back shell.

[0009] It is still another object of this invention to provide a connector sufficiently enhanced in shielding function.

Tanaka is unambiguously directed to a connector, not to a bin. Nothing in Tanaka discloses that the connector of Tanaka is a bin or that it can be used for storage. Nor does anything in Tanaka suggest or imply this. The figures of Tanaka, specifically figures 4A, 4B, 5A, and 5B demonstrate how the invention of Tanaka is to be mounted to a board for completing an electrical connection, not to receive articles for storage. In the "Response To Arguments" section of the Examiner's December 13, 2007 final rejection, the Examiner states:

The applicant has argued that the Tanaka reference fails to disclose a radio bin spacer. This is unpersuasive because the claim limitation of a "radio bin spacer" refers to a function or use of the device, which only carries patentable weight as it is delineated by its structure. In that [sic the] absence of any further limitations as to what a radio bin spacer may entail, the Tanaka structure meets the structural limitations of the claims.

(See December 13, 2007 Final Office Action, page 4.)

By attacking this claim limitation as referring to the function of the device, the Examiner appears to have focused exclusively on Applicants' intended use of the bin while ignoring the fact that the claim, regardless of use, recites a bin. Use of the claim term "bin" throughout independent claims 1 and 10 does provide a structural limitation that the Tanaka reference lacks.

Second, Tanaka fails to disclose the "pair of spacer stanchions" located on the closed rear end of the bin. A stanchion is an upright bar, post, prop, brace, or support. Tanaka does not disclose any upright bars, posts, props, braces or supports located on the closed rear end of the bin. The Examiner asserts that the features identified by reference numerals 2a and 2b in Tanaka are a pair of spacer stanchions. They are not. Rather, the features of Tanaka identified



by the reference numerals 2a and 2b are electrical terminals, not stanchions. Tanaka states "the back shell 2 has a pair of wide terminals 2a formed on opposite sides thereof to be connected to the circuit board 7, and a pair of relatively narrow terminals 2b disposed between terminals 2a." See Tanaka, ¶ 0037. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in either the specification or the drawings of Tanaka to support an interpretation of electrical terminals 2a and 2b as being an upright bar, post, prop, brace or support. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to disclose the recited pair of spacer stanchions located on the closed rear end of the bin.

Third, Tanaka fails to disclose a bin, or any other component, having interior dimensions that allow for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein. Although the Examiner asserts that reference numeral 1 of Tanaka identifies an "open end" as recited by Applicants' claim 1, reference numeral 1 does not identify an "open end." Rather, reference numeral 1 identifies a closed end having a plurality of small holes which appear to be positioned to receive the prongs of an electrical connector. Even if the plurality of small holes that the Examiner relies on could be construed as an "open end," there is no disclosure or suggestion in Tanaka that the individual holes have interior dimensions that would allow for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to disclose a bin having interior dimensions allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein.

Fourth, Tanaka does not disclose an apparatus that provides a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio. This limitation is explicitly recited in claim 1. There is, however, no disclosure in Tanaka, either in the patent figures or the specification, that discloses or even suggests this element. Furthermore, the Examiner failed to identify with particularity the portion of Tanaka that supports the Examiner's assertion that this claim element is disclosed. Instead, on page 2 of the December 13, 2007 Office Action the Examiner simply makes the naked assertion that this element is present. This omission leaves questions as to how this limitation in claim 1 corresponds to features in the prior

art. Applicants therefore invoke the requirements of MPEP § 1207.02, which requires the Examiner's answer to point out where this specific limitation recited in claim 1 can be found in Tanaka.

The Examiner has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation to support the Examiner's rejection of claim 10. Claim 10 reads as follows, with the portions relevant to this appeal shown in bold:

10. A radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designed for a larger radio comprising:

a generally rectangular radio **bin** spacer having one closed rear end and one open end and further having a planar top wall, a planar bottom wall and two planar side walls; said top wall having a structural rib located thereon; said side walls each having a mounting tab located thereon wherein each said mounting tab has a bore located therein; **structural ribs located on said side walls adjacent to said mounting tabs**; said closed rear end of said bin **having a pair of spacer stanchions located thereon**; and said bin having exterior dimensions allowing mounting within an instrument panel opening designed for a larger than standard sized radio and **further having interior dimensions allowing mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein**; **thereby providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio.**

Each of the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1 are also applicable to the identical limitations recited in claim 10, highlighted above and, for the sake of brevity, will not be repeated here.

Claim 10 recites the additional limitation of "structural ribs located on said side walls adjacent to said mounting tabs." The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 10 simply fails to address the presence of this element in Tanaka. Furthermore, a review of the figures of Tanaka fails to disclose the presence of any structural ribs located on side walls adjacent to



mounting tabs. If the Examiner persists in this assertion, then under the applicable provisions of MPEP § 1207.2, Applicants' request that the Examiner's answer point out where this specific limitation can be found in Tanaka.

In summary, Tanaka fails to disclose many of the elements recited in claims 1 and 10. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation and the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 10 must be reversed.

**B. Claims 2-7 And 11-15 Are Patentable  
Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Tanaka  
In View Of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,121**

Claims 2-7 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,121 issued to Kobayashi, et al. (hereinafter "Kobayashi"). Applicants believe that the Examiner rejected these claims in error and ask that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner.

First, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Here, the combination of Tanaka with Kobayashi fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of dependent claims 2-7 and 11-15.

As discussed above, Tanaka does not anticipate independent claims 1 or 10 because Tanaka fails to disclose or suggest several of the elements recited in those claims. Dependent claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 11-15 depend from independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 2-7 incorporate each and every element of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 11-15 incorporate each and every element of independent claim 10. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-7 and dependent claims 11-15 each recite a bin; a pair of spacer stanchions located on the closed rear end; a bin having interior

dimensions allowing mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein; and providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio. Additionally, dependent claims 11-15 also require structural ribs located on said side walls adjacent to said mounting tabs. As set out above, none of these elements are disclosed or suggested by Tanaka. The combination of Tanaka with Kobayashi fails to cure this deficit because Kobayashi also fails to disclose these elements and, without them, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to claims 2-7 and 11-15.

Second, neither Tanaka nor Kobayashi are analogous art to Applicants' disclosure (or to each other). Combining these references in an attempt to render Applicants' claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore improper; neither reference may be considered. "In order to rely on a reference as the basis for a rejection of an Applicants' invention, the reference must either be in the field of the Applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the invention was concerned." *In Re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *See also* MPEP § 2141.01(a) entitled *Analogous and Non-Analogous Art*. As set forth in Applicants' application, the field of the invention is as follows:

The present invention generally relates to a vehicle interior and, more particularly, to spacer bin that provides for mounting a standard radio within an instrument panel cavity designed for the larger sized radio having a navigation screen.

Neither Tanaka nor Kobayashi are within Applicants' field of endeavor. This is not only clear from the fact that neither reference is within the same classification assigned to Applicants' invention, but also from the title of each reference and a review of each of the reference's summary of invention. As set forth above, Tanaka discloses a connector. Kobayashi discloses an optical prism, a display element support, and an optical assembly using the same (see Kobayashi, title). Neither reference relates to a vehicle interior, let alone to bins that allow the mounting of standard sized radios within an instrument panel cavity designed for a larger

sized radio having a navigation screen. Thus, neither reference has anything to do with the problem Applicants were seeking to resolve and the Examiner evidently used impermissible hindsight based on Applicants' disclosure to piece together these unrelated prior art references to support the rejection.

Applicants alerted the Examiner to the non-analogous nature of the cited references in Applicants' November 2, 2007 response to the Examiner's July 27, 2007 Office Action. In the Examiner's final rejection, on pages 4-5, the Examiner acknowledged that prior art references must either be in the field of Applicants' endeavor or be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was concerned in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. The Examiner then summarily concluded that "in this case, the making and manufacturing of items and the use of different material is well known to be the same endeavor." See Examiner's December 13, 2007 final rejection, page 5. This argument completely re-characterizes Applicants' stated field of endeavor, broadening it substantially. In the process, the Examiner failed to address Applicants' argument that neither Tanaka nor Kobayashi are related to Applicants' stated field of endeavor. Tanaka is directed to an electrical connector and Kobayashi is directed to a face mask having an optical display element. Neither have anything to do with mounting a radio in the console of a vehicle in a space that is larger than is needed to accommodate the radio. Because these references are not analogous art, they may not be properly combined to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Because the combination of Tanaka with Kobayashi fails to disclose the presence of every element recited in dependent claims 2-7 and 11-15 and thus fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and because, even if such *prima facie* case of obviousness is established, the combination of these references is improper because they are not analogous art to Applicants' disclosure, Applicants submit that the Examiner's final rejection

of these claims was in error. Applicants respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-7 and 11-15.

**C. Claims 8, 9, 16 And 17 Are Patentable  
Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Tanaka In  
View Of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0231954**

Claims 8, 9, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0231954 to Czech (hereinafter "Czech"). Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner's rejection was in error and request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's rejection.

First, as discussed above, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references, when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Here, the combination of Tanaka with Czech fails to disclose each and every claim limitation of the rejected claims. As set forth in the preceding sections, Tanaka fails to disclose each and every claim limitation of independent claims 1 and 10. Dependent claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 16 and 17 depend from independent claim 10. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Tanaka fails to disclose each and every element of dependent claims 8, 9, 16, and 17. Czech fails to supply the missing claim elements. Czech discloses a recessed downlight mounting fixture. See Czech, title; ¶ 0005. As such, Czech does not disclose the missing elements such as a bin, a pair of spacer stanchions, interior dimensions allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein, or providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel size for a larger radio. Accordingly, the combination of Tanaka with Czech fails to disclose each and every claim element of dependent claims 8, 9, 16, and 17 and, consequently, fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Second, neither Tanaka nor Czech may be properly considered to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because neither prior art reference is analogous art. Neither

Tanaka nor Czech are within Applicants' field of endeavor. This is not only clear from the fact that neither reference is within the same classification assigned to Applicants' invention, but also from a review of each reference. Neither reference relates to a vehicle interior, let alone to spacer bins that provide for the mounting of standard radios within an instrument panel cavity designed for larger sized radios having a navigation screen. Tanaka's inapplicability was addressed in the preceding section and will not be repeated here. As to Czech, it is directed to recessed downlight mounting fixtures such as those typically found in commercial and residential structures. See Czech, ¶ 0007. Czech is in different U.S. and international classifications and is entirely unconcerned with the problem that Applicants sought to solve. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to consider Czech to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 8, 9, 16, and 17.

Because the combination of Tanaka with Czech fails to disclose the presence of every element recited in dependent claims 2-7 and 11-15, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Even if such *prima facie* case of obviousness could be established by the combination of these references, the combination of these references is improper because they are not analogous art to Applicants' disclosure. Applicants submit that the Examiner's final rejection of these claims was in error and respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the rejection of dependent claims 8-9 and 16-17.

### **Conclusion**

For all of the reasons set forth above, the final rejection of these claims should be reversed. The fee of \$510.00 is applicable under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2) is being filed electronically herewith. Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment in connection with this filing to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Paul Wayne Nagy, et al.**

By: /Seth E. Rodack/  
Seth E. Rodack  
Registration No. 45,622  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: March 10, 2008  
**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351  
Enclosure - Appendices



### **VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designed for a larger radio comprising:

a generally rectangular radio bin spacer having one closed rear end and one open end and further having a planar top wall, a planar bottom wall and two planar side walls; said top wall having a structural rib located thereon; said side walls each having a mounting tab located thereon wherein each said mounting tab has a bore located therein; said closed rear end of said bin having a pair of spacer stanchions located thereon; and said bin having exterior dimensions allowing mounting within an instrument panel opening designed for a larger than standard sized radio and further having interior dimensions allowing mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein; thereby providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio.

2. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 1 wherein, said radio bin spacer is an injection molded plastic.

3. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 2 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of polypropylene.

4. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 2 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of thermoplastic olefins (TPO).

5. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 2 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS).

6. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 2 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded from polypropylene.

7. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 2 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of polycarbonate.

8. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 1 wherein, said radio spacer bin is a cast metal.

9. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 8 wherein, said radio spacer bin is cast from one of the group consisting of magnesium, aluminum, alloys of magnesium, and alloys of aluminum.

10. A radio bin spacer allowing for the mounting of a standard sized radio in a mounting area designed for a larger radio comprising:

a generally rectangular radio bin spacer having one closed rear end and one open end and further having a planar top wall, a planar bottom wall and two planar side walls; said top wall having a structural rib located thereon; said side walls each having a mounting tab located thereon wherein each said mounting tab has a bore located therein; structural ribs located on said side walls adjacent to said mounting tabs; said closed rear end of said bin having a pair of spacer stanchions located thereon; and said bin having exterior dimensions allowing mounting within an instrument panel opening designed for a larger than standard sized radio and further having interior dimensions allowing mounting of a standard sized radio directly therein; thereby providing a mounting area sized for a standard radio in an opening in an instrument panel sized for a larger radio.

11. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 10 wherein, said radio bin spacer is an injection molded plastic.

12. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 11 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of polypropylene.

13. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 11 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of thermoplastic olefins (TPO).

14. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 11 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS).

15. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 11 wherein, said radio spacer bin is injection molded of polycarbonate.

16. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 10 wherein, said radio spacer bin is a cast metal.

17. The radio bin spacer as claimed in Claim 16 wherein, said radio spacer bin is cast from one of the group consisting of magnesium, aluminum, alloys of magnesium, and alloys of aluminum.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.